

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/707,612	12/24/2003	Daniel W. Cushing	03-1090	1611
64722 7590 05/08/2007 OSTRAGER CHONG FLAHERTY & BROITMAN, P.C. 570 LEXINGTON AVENUE FLOOR 17 NEW YORK, NY 10022-6894			EXAMINER	
			PIZIALI, ANDREW T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW TORK,	11 10022-0054		1771	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

8	

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/707,612	CUSHING ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Andrew T. Piziali	1771	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --THE REPLY FILED 30 April 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: The period for reply expires ____ ___months from the mailing date of the final rejection. a) b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). **NOTICE OF APPEAL** 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). **AMENDMENTS** 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below): (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The 35 USC 112 rejection of claims 1, 2, 4 and 5. 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 7. 🛛 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) 🗌 will not be entered, or b) 🖾 will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,4 and 5. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 6-18 and 40. AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. 🖾 The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 13. Other: ____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

The applicant asserts that Tsotsis fails to teach or suggest the use of glass fibers. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Tsotsis specifically refers to glass fibers (see [0022]). Gomez was specifically cited to teach that it is known in the resin/fiber composite art to use s-type or e-type glass fibers.

The applicant asserts that the applied prior art fails to teach or suggest the claimed composite material because Tsotsis allegedly fails to teach or suggest that the fibers are embedded in the polyphenylsulfone. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Tsotsis discloses that the fibers may be sandwiched between two layers of polyphenylsulfone material and melt-bonded together ([0040] and Figure 3 and 3a).

The applicant asserts that there is no motivation to combine the references. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Tsotsis is silent with regards to specific glass fibers, therefore, it would have been obvious to look to the prior art for conventional glass fibers. Gomez provides this conventional teaching showing that it is known in the resin/fiber composite art to use s-type or e-type glass fibers. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the glass fibers from s-type or e-type glass fibers, as taught by Gomez, motivated by the expectation of successfully practicing the invention of Tsotsis.

In response to applicant's argument that Gomez is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir.

1992). In this case, Gomez is at least in the field of applicant's endeavor, which is resin/fiber composites.

ANDREW PIZIALI PRIMARY EXAMINER